

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02787 01 OF 04 061121 Z

11

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AECE-00 AEC-11

OMB-01 RSR-01 ACDA-19 /155 W
----- 127649

P R 061010 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8348

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

USMISSION GENEVA

USDEL SALT TWO II

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 4 VIENNA 2787

GENEVA FOR DISTO

FROM US REP MBFR

EO 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: MBFR: APRIL 5 DISCUSSION BETWEEN NETHERLANDS AND US
REPS AND SOVIET AND HUNGARIAN REPS ON HUNGARIAN ISSUE

ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: DISCUSSION AFTERNOON OF APRIL 5 REPRESENTED
INCONCLUSIVE ATTEMPT TO CONTINUE DEVELOPING COMMON TEXT
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02787 01 OF 04 061121 Z

EMBODYING DIFFERENT POINTS OF VIEWS OF BOTH SIDES. AT OUTSET OF MEETING, SOVIETS CIRCULATED THEIR VERSION OF RESULTS OF PREVIOUS DAYS DRAFTING SESSION (TEXT IN SEPTEL. THIS VERSION EXCLUDED ALLIED RESERVATIONS ON LIST OF 11 STATES IN PARA 2 AND TEXT OF PROPOSED COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS BY HUNGARY AND BY WESTERN SIDE. MOREOVER, SOVIET TEXT INCLUDES NAMES OF STATES IN FIRST THREE PARAS, USING WHAT SOVIETS DESCRIBED AS " OFFICIAL NAMES", WITH THE POSSIBLE EFFECT OF RAISING QUESTION OF DESIGNATION OF FRG. ALLIED REPS ALSO COMMENTED THAT DRAFT CIRCULATED BY SOVIETS DID NOT CONTAIN TEXT OF COMPLEMENTARY UNILATERAL STATEMENTS PROPOSED IN THE PREVIOUS SESSION BY ALLIED REPS. THEY MADE CLEAR THAT ANY ALLIED DISCUSSION OF AND COMMENTARY ON AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WOULD HAVE TO BE ACCOMPANIED BY CORRESPONDING EASTERN WILLINGNESS TO DISCUSS AND MAKE SUGGESTIONS ON STATEMENTS PROPOSED BY ALLIED REPS WHICH SHOULD HAVE FULLY EQUAL STATUS. EASTERN REPS ARGUED THAT IT WAS INEQUITABLE TO MAKE DISCUSSION OF THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA CONTINGENT ON PARALLEL DISCUSSION OF STATEMENTS PROPOSED BY ALLIED REPS, SINCE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA REPRESENTED A GENUINELY NEUTRAL APPROACH TO RESOLVING THE ISSUE OF FUTURE PARTICIPATION WHILE ALLIED STATEMENTS DID NOT. ALLIED REPS RESPONDED THAT THEIR STATEMENTS WERE DESIGNED TO SERVE SAME FUNCTION AS ENLARGEMENT FORMULA, I. E., AS A WAY TO DEAL WITH THE HUNGARIAN ISSUE, AND THAT DISCUSSION OF ENLARGEMENT FORMULA COULD NOT TAKE PLACE WITHOUT PARALLEL DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED STATEMENTS. PROCEDURAL BICKERING ENDED WITH AGREEMENT TO USE THREE- COLUMN APPROACH ON SEPARATE SHEETS FOR MOST CONTENTIOUS TOPICS. NEXT MEETING WAS SCHEDULED FOR THE AFTERNOON OF APRIL 6. END SUMMARY.

2. APRIL 5 SESSION ON THE HUNGARIAN ISSUE TOOK PLACE AT HUNGARIAN EMBASSY. NETHERLANDS AND US REPRESENTATIVES WERE PRESENT, AS WERE KHLESTOV, KVITSINSKIY AND TIMERBAYEV FROM THE USSR, AND USTOR AND PETRAN FROM HUNGARY.

3. AT OUTSET OF MEETING, SOVIETS CIRCULATED THEIR SUMMARY VERSION OF APRIL 4 DISCUSSION, WHICH IN EFFECT EMBODIED THE TEXT THEY HAD PROPOSED IN THE PREVIOUS SESSION, ALONG WITH A SELECTIVE NOTATION OF ALLIED COMMENTS AND RESERVATIONS ON THIS TEXT. ALLIED PROPOSAL THAT FIRST PARA, WHICH LISTS ALL STATES PARTICIPATING IN VIENNA TALKS, INCLUDE PHRASE " RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE" WAS INCLUDED, AS WAS ALLIED RESERVATION ON CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02787 01 OF 04 061121 Z

EASTERN FORMULATION IN PARA 2 (TO THE EFFECT THAT DIRECT PAR-

TICIPANTS WERE " POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS IN POSSIBLE AGREEMENTS IN REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN CENTRAL EUROPE,") AND RESERVATIONS ON PARA 5 ON CHAIRMANSHIP AND PARA 6 ON RIGHTS OF PARTICIPANTS. MAJOR ALLIED RESERVATION ON PARA 2, WHICH LINKED CATEGORY OF 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WITH STATEMENTS ON HUNGARY, WAS EXCLUDED. EASTERN RESERVATIONS ON ALLIED PROPOSAL FOR FIRST PARA, AND ON PARA 10 RELATING TO CARRYING OVER PRESENT AGREED ARRANGEMENTS TO THE NEGOTIATIONS, WERE CARRIED AS BRACKETS. ALLIED RESERVATIONS AS ENUMERATED ABOVE WERE CARRIED AS PARENTHESES. SOVIET TEXT INCLUDED LISTS OF STATES IN PARAS 1, 2, AND 3, INCLUDING DESIGNATION OF FRG AS FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY.

4. NETHERLANDS REP BEGAN DISCUSSION BY SAYING THAT SESSION THE PREVIOUS DAY HAD BEEN A USEFUL ONE, AND THAT HE WAS PLEASED THAT THE GROUP WAS WORKING ON A DEFINITE TEXT. HE CONTINUED TO SAY THAT PARAS 4 THROUGH 10 OF THE PROPOSAL ADVANCED THE DAY BEFORE BY THE EASTERN SIDE SEEMED IN GENERAL TO BE LESS DIFFICULT THAN THE OTHER ONES AND PROPOSED THAT THESE SHOULD BE RESERVED FOR LATER DISCUSSION. HE THEN SAID THAT THE FIRST PARA SEEMED TO BE IN ORDER PROVIDED THE EASTERN SIDE COULD AGREE TO INCLUDE THE PHRASE " RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE." HE ASKED THE EASTERN SPOKESMEN WHAT THEIR POSITION WAS ON THIS QUESTION.

5. KHESTOV REPLIED THAT BEFORE GOING ON TO INDIVIDUAL NUANCES IN THE TEXT HE HAD CIRCULATED, IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE TO DISCUSS THE QUESTION OF LISTING THE STATES IN THE FIRST PARA. HE SAID THAT THIS QUESTION OF DESIGNATION WAS AN IMPORTANT ONE FOR THE SOVIET UNION. HE ADDED THAT THE NAMES GIVEN IN THE TEXT JUST CIRCULATED WERE THE OFFICIAL NAMES OF THE PARTICIPATING STATES, AND ALSO IN KEEPING WITH COMMON PRACTICE. FLOURISHING A PACKET OF PAPERS, HE SAID THAT HE HAD A NUMBER OF DOCUMENTS TO SUPPORT HIS VIEWS ON THE OFFICIAL DESIGNATION OF PARTICIPATING STATES.

6. THE US REP REPLIED THAT THERE WAS NO NEED TO PERUSE THESE DOCUMENTS. THE NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT HE AND THE US REP WOULD PASS ON THE DESIGNATIONS OF STATES AS LISTED IN THE SOVIET TEXT TO THEIR ALLIES SO THAT EACH COUNTRY COULD VERIFY WHETHER ITS NAME WAS CORRECTLY LISTED OR NOT. THE US REP THEN ASKED WHAT KIND OF SEATING ARRANGEMENTS WOULD ACCOMPANY
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 VIENNA 02787 01 OF 04 061121 Z

THE ALPHABETIC LIST OF NAMES AS PRESENTED IN THE SOVIET TEXT.

CONFIDENTIAL

ADP000
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02787 02 OF 04 061134 Z

11
ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AECE-00 AEC-11

OMB-01 ACDA-19 RSR-01 /155 W
----- 127755

P R 061010 Z APR 73
FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8349
INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY HELSINKI
AMEMBASSY LONDON
AMEMBASSY MOSCOW
USMISSION NATO
USMISSION GENEVA
USDEL SALT TWO II
USNMR SHAPE
USLOSACLANT
USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 4 VIENNA 2787

GENEVA FOR DISTO

ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH

FROM US REP MBFR

7. KHLESTOV REPLIED THAT HE SAW NO GREAT PROBLEM WITH THE LIST OF NAMES IN THE SOVIET TEXT, SINCE THEY WERE SIMPLY THE OFFICIAL NAMES OF THE COUNTRIES. AS FOR THE QUESTION OF SEATING, HE THOUGHT THAT IT WOULD LOGICALLY FOLLOW FROM THE SEQUENCE SET FORTH IN THE SOVIET LIST. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF THERE WERE OTHER PROPOSALS, HIS SIDE WOULD BE WILLING TO EXAMINE THEM.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02787 02 OF 04 061134 Z

8. KHLESTOV THEN SUGGESTED PROCEEDING TO PARA 2, RELATING TO DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. HE ASKED WHAT THE VIEW OF THE ALLIED REPS WAS ABOUT THE EASTERN FORMULATION ON ENLARGEMENT. HE ADDED THAT, AS HAD BEEN MADE CLEAR IN PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS, THIS WAS A GENUINELY NEUTRAL APPROACH TO THE QUESTION OF FUTURE PARTICIPATION WHICH WOULD NOT PREJUDICE THE INTERESTS OF EITHER SIDE. THUS, WHAT WERE THE ALLIED VIEWS ON THIS FORMULATION?

9. THE NETHERLANDS REP POINTED OUT THAT HE HAD EARLIER ASKED A QUESTION CONCERNING PARA 1 ABOUT EASTERN VIEWS ON THE ALLIED PROPOSAL THAT IT CONTAIN THE PHRASE " RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE." KHLESTOV REPLIED THAT THIS POINT WAS UNDER CONSIDERATION BY THE EASTERN SIDE, AND THAT THE ALLIES WOULD HAVE AN ANSWER LATER ON. THE NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT, AS A GENERAL OBSERVATION ON THE PAPER PASSED OUT BY THE SOVIETS, IT APPEARED TO BE MERELY A RECAPITULATION OF EASTERN VIEWS ON THE SOLUTION OF THE PARTICIPATION PROBLEM. THE ALLIED SPOKESMEN, HE CONTINUED, HAD PROPOSED SOME SOLUTIONS WHICH REPRESENTED A NEUTRAL APPROACH, AND HAD FURTHER BELIEVED THAT ALL PARTICIPANTS IN THE PRESENT DISCUSSION WERE CURRENTLY ENGAGED IN DRAFTING WITH A VIEW TO ARRIVING AT A COMMON TEXT. THE EASTERN TEXT QUITE OBVIOUSLY OMITTED THE ALLIED PROPOSAL ON COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS BY HUNGARY AND BY THE WESTERN SIDE. IN ORDER TO CONTINUE WORK PRODUCTIVELY, HE SUGGESTED THAT DRAFTING NOW CONTINUE WITH A 3- COLUMN APPROACH TO DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TWO SIDES, WITH ONE COLUMN EMBODYING ALLIED VIEWS, ONE COLUMN EMBODYING EASTERN VIEWS, AND A MIDDLE COLUMN RESERVED FOR EFFORTS TO DRAFT COMPROMISE LANGUAGE BETWEEN THE TWO POSITIONS. HE SUGGESTED THAT THIS METHOD BE APPLIED TO DIFFERENCES IN PARAS 2 AND 3 OF THE SOVIET TEXT. PARA TWO, FOR EXAMPLE, WOULD CONTAIN ON ONE SIDE TEXT REFLECTING THE ALLIED VIEW THAT A LIST OF 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS SHOULD BE FOLLOWED BY TWO COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS. ON THE OTHER SIDE WOULD BE THE SOVIET TEXT FOR A CATEGORY OF 11 PLUS AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA. THIS WOULD REPRESENT A NEUTRAL AND NON- COMMITTAL WAY TO TRY TO FIND A COMMON SOLUTION.

10. KHLESTOV REPLIED THAT THE EASTERN SIDE DID NOT THINK ANY STATEMENTS SHOULD BE MADE, AND CERTAINLY SHOULD NOT BE EMBODIED IN A PROCEDURES PAPER. HE SAID THAT IF THE ALLIES DID INSIST ON HAVING A STATEMENT, OR IF THEY SOUGHT EASTERN AGREEMENT TO SUCH A STATEMENT, THE EAST WOULD RESPOND WITH A SEPARATE CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02787 02 OF 04 061134 Z

STATEMENT WHICH WOULD REPLY TO ANY ALLIED MENTION OF HUNGARY WITH A COMPARABLE MENTION OF ITALY. IN ANY CASE, ANY SUCH STATE-

MENTS SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED AS PART OF THE PROCEDURES PAPER.

11. THE US REP RESPONDED BY SAYING THAT WHEN THE ALLIES HAD SUGGESTED THAT HUNGARY SHOULD BE LEFT IN ABEYANCE, THEY HAD SAID THAT THIS COULD BE DONE BY MEANS OF A STATEMENT IN THE TEXT OF THE PROCEDURES PAPER, FOLLOWING A LIST OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. THIS CONTINUED TO BE THE ALLIED VIEW. SINCE THAT TIME, THE ALLIES HAD ALSO SUGGESTED THAT THE STATEMENT COULD IF IT INCREASED ITS ACCEPTABILITY BE DIVIDED INTO TWO COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS, ONE TO BE MADE BY HUNGARY, THE OTHER BY THE ALLIED SIDE. THE ALLIES HAD STRESSED THAT IN EITHER VERSION SUCH STATEMENTS SHOULD BE IN THE TEXT OF A PROCEDURES PAPER FOLLOWING THE LIST OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. IN SHORT, IF HUNGARY WERE TO DISAPPEAR FROM THE LIST OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, STATEMENTS ALONG THE LINES SUGGESTED BY THE ALLIES WOULD HAVE TO BE MADE AND WOULD HAVE TO BE IN A PROCEDURAL TEXT. HE THEN REMINDED THE EASTERN REPS THAT AMB QUARLES HAD JUST NOTED THAT THE ALLIED SIDE WOULD BE WILLING TO HAVE A LIST OF 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS PROVIDED THAT THE STATEMENTS PROPOSED BY THE WESTERN SIDE BE GIVEN EQUAL STATUS WITH THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA PROPOSED BY THE EAST. THE EASTERN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WAS ONE WAY TO DEAL WITH A LIST OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WHICH DID NOT INCLUDE HUNGARY; THE ALLIED PROPOSAL OF STATEMENTS WAS ANOTHER WAY. BOTH SHOULD HAVE EQUAL STATUS AND BE CONSIDERED ON AN EQUAL BASIS. HE THEN PROPOSED TO CONTINUE WORK ON A TEXT REFLECTING DIFFERENCES BY MEANS OF TEMPORARILY REMOVING PARAS 2 AND 3 INCLUDING BOTH SOVIET ENLARGEMENT FORMULA AND PROPOSED ALLIED STATEMENTS FROM THE FULL TEXT OF A PROCEDURES PAPER, AND EXAMINING EACH PARA SEPARATELY, IN A 3- COLUMN APPROACH, ON A SEPARATE SHEET OF PAPER FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECORDING DIFFERENT VIEWS AND SEEKING POSSIBLE COMPROMISE WORDING.

CONFIDENTIAL

ADP000

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02787 03 OF 04 061150 Z

12

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AECE-00 AEC-11

OMB-01 ACDA-19 RSR-01 /155 W

----- 127875

P R 061010 Z APR 73
FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8350
INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY HELSINKI
AMEMBASSY LONDON
AMEMBASSY MOSCOW
USMISSION NATO
USMISSION GENEVA
USDEL SALT TWO II
USNMR SHAPE
USLOSACLANT
USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 3 OF 4 VIENNA 2787

GENEVA FOR DISTO

ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH

FROM US REP MBFR

12. KHLESTOV ASKED WHY THE ALLIED STATEMENTS SHOULD BE GIVEN THE SAME STATUS AS THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA. THE US REP REPLIED THAT BOTH THE EASTERN AND THE ALLIED PROPOSALS COULD BE CONCEIVED AS SERVING THE SAME FUNCTION WITH RELATION TO THE PARTICIPATION OF HUNGARY. THEY BOTH SHOULD BE CONSIDERED ON THE BASIS OF EQUALITY, SINCE IT WAS POSSIBLE THAT AN AGREED PAPER WOULD INCORPORATE BOTH. KHLESTOV THEN SAID THAT ANY ALLIED STATE-
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02787 03 OF 04 061150 Z

MENTS WHICH WOULD SINGLE OUT HUNGARY WOULD BE MATCHED BY RECIPROCATING EASTERN STATEMENTS SINGLING OUT ITALY. THESE SETS OF STATEMENTS SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED IN A PROCEDURAL PAPER. THE PROPOSED EASTERN FORMULA FOR ENLARGEMENT WAS ONE DESIGNED TO COVER THE NEEDS OF THE ALLIED SIDE, AND CREATE A JURIDICAL BASIS FOR ENLARGED FUTURE PARTICIPATION, IN THIS WAY COVERING THE CASE OF HUNGARY. HE THEN SAID THAT IN ANY INTERNATIONAL DISCUSSION OR NEGOTIATION, IT WAS PROPER TO HAVE A PROCEDURAL DOCUMENT WHICH GAVE AN AGREED BASIS DEFINING PARTICIPATION. FROM THIS VIEWPOINT THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA PROVIDED A BASIS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO BOTH SIDES. IF THE ALLES WANTED TO ADD ON TO IT, FOR EXAMPLE, ON THE BASIS OF A STATEMENT, THE EASTERN SIDE COULD PUT DOWN THESE IDEAS ON A SEPARATE PAPER AND WOULD BE GLAD TO EXAMINE THEM. THEN THE EAST FOUND IT NECESSARY TO REACT TO SUCH AN ALLIED IDEA, IT WOULD APPEND ITS VIEWS TO THE ALLIED STATEMENT. AT THIS POINT,

HOWEVER, HE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE THE ALLIES' REACTION TO THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA, SO THAT THIS COULD BE STUDIED.

13. THE HUNGARIAN REP SAID THAT IMPLICITLY THE IDEA OF A STATEMENT WAS AS AN ORAL FORM OF EXPRESSION. THUS, THERE WAS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WHAT SHOULD APPEAR IN A PROTOCOL ON PROCEDURES AND THE TEXTS OF POSSIBLE STATEMENTS THAT THE ALLIES MIGHT WISH TO MAKE AND TO WHICH THE EASTERN SIDE MIGHT WISH TO RESPOND. AS A CONSEQUENCE, ANY SUCH TEXTS SHOULD NOT BE EMBODIED IN A PROTOCOL BUT SHOULD BE LISTED SEPARATELY, AND THEN COULD BE EXAMINED TO SEE IF THEY CONTRIBUTED TO A SOLUTION OF THE PARTICIPATION PROPOSAL. THE DEPUTY HUNGARIAN REP (PETRAN) ADDED THAT IT WAS NORMAL IN CONFS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS TO BE ISSUED IN ADDITION TO A PROTOCOL AS A MEANS FOR EXPRESSING VIEWS ON VARIOUS QUESTIONS.

14. THE NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT IN SEEKING A SOLUTION TO THE QUESTION OF PARTICIPATION, THE ALLIES BELIEVED THAT ANY LIST OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WHICH DID NOT INCLUDE HUNGARY WOULD HAVE TO BE ACCOMPANIED BY A PARA ON THE IDEA THAT THE PARTICIPATION OF HUNGARY REMAINED AN OPEN ONE. THIS COULD BE DONE IN THE FORM OF STATEMENTS, ALTHOUGH IT WAS THE CONCEPT INVOLVED RATHER THAN THE FORM WHICH WAS THE MAIN POINT. IN FACT, THE EASTERN SIDE HAD ADVANCED AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA AS AN EFFORT TO SOLVE THIS PROBLEM. THE ALLIES, BEARING IN MIND THEIR SECURITY INTERESTS, HAD SOUGHT TO WORK TOWARD RESOLVING THE PROBLEM BY MEANS OF
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02787 03 OF 04 061150 Z

STATEMENTS. THE TWO APPROACHES THUS WERE AIMED AT A COMMON PROBLEM, AND WERE LINKED. AS A RESULT, THE ALLIES HAD SUGGESTED THAT THEY BOTH BE ADDRESSED IN A WORKING TEXT AIMED AT REFLECTING DIFFERENCES AND THEN FIND A COMMON LANGUAGE. IN THIS CONTEXT IT WAS NECESSARY TO CONSIDER THE PROPOSALS OF BOTH SIDES. IN FACT, THE ALLIED PROPOSAL OF STATEMENTS AND THE EASTERN PROPOSAL OF ENLARGEMENT WERE EQUIVALENT AND BOTH HAD TO BE CONSIDERED.

15. THE US REP SAID THAT THE STATEMENTS PROPOSED BY THE ALLIES WERE NOT NECESSARILY INTENDED TO BE COMPETITIVE TO THE EASTERN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA -- EACH MIGHT BE PART OF A SINGLE AGREED SOLUTION -- AND THAT THE ALLIES COULD CONSIDER BOTH APPROACHES TOGETHER IN AN AGREED PROCEDURES PAPER. BOTH SIDES, HE FELT, WOULD WISH TO MAKE SUGGESTIONS ON EACH OTHER'S RESPECTIVE PROPOSALS. HE THEN SUGGESTED THAT PARAS 2 AND 3 IN THE SOVIET TEXT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED SEPARATELY, EACH ON A SEPARATE SHEET.

16. KHLESTOV SAID THAT IN RESPONSE TO THE ALLIED PROPOSAL FOR STATEMENTS, THE EASTERN SIDE SAID THAT THERE SHOULD BE NO

STATEMENTS. THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WAS A NEUTRAL ONE -- THE ALLIED PROPOSAL FOR STATEMENTS, WHICH WOULD MENTION HUNGARY ALONE, WAS NOT A NEUTRAL ONE, AND WOULD HAVE TO BE MATCHED BY A SOVIET STATEMENT ON ITALY. THE EASTERN SIDE WOULD BE PREPARED TO CONSIDER ANY ALTERNATIVE LANGUAGE FOR AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA THAT THE ALLIED REPS MIGHT WISH TO PROPOSE.

17. THE US REP SAID THAT HE AND THE NETHERLANDS REP WOULD BE PREPARED TO DISCUSS THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA IN TERMS OF SPECIFIC LANGUAGE AT THE NEXT SESSION. HE WISHED TO MAKE IT CLEAR, HOWEVER, THAT SUCH DISCUSSION WOULD NOT TAKE PLACE ALONE AND UNACCOMPANIED BY PARALLEL DISCUSSION OF THE ALLIED STATEMENTS. HE THEN SAID THAT, IN LIGHT OF THE INCOMPLETE ACCOUNT OF THE APRIL 4 DISCUSSION REFLECTED IN THE SOVIET TEXT, IT MIGHT BE PREFERABLE FOR BOTH SIDES TO CONTINUE WITH THEIR DRAFTING EFFORTS IN A MORE PRIMITIVE MODE, EACH SIDE KEEPING ITS OWN DRAFT PROCEDURAL TEXT WITH THE GOAL OF EVENTUALLY GETTING AN AGREED PAPER.

CONFIDENTIAL

ADP000

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02787 04 OF 04 061157 Z

12

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 ACDA-19 AEC-11 AECE-00

OIC-04 OMB-01 RSR-01 /155 W

----- 127934

P R 061010 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8353

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

USMISSION GENEVA

USDEL SALT TWO II

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 4 OF 4 VIENNA 2787

GENEVA FOR DISTO

ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH

FROM US REP MBFR

18. TIMERBAYEV COMMENTED THAT THE SUGGESTION BY THE US REP THAT EACH SIDE KEEP ITS OWN TEXT WAS A RETROGRESSION FROM WORKING ON A SINGLE PAPER WITH BRACKETS. THE US REP REPLIED THAT THE SOVIET TEXT PURPORTING TO REFLECT DISCUSSION DURING THE PREVIOUS SESSION POSED OBIOUS PROBLEMS AND THAT THE ALLIED REPRESENTATIVES HAD JUST SUGGESTED AN ALTERNATE WAY OF KEEPING A COMMON TEXT BY MEANS OF 3 COLUMNS REFLECTING AGREEMENT, DISAGREEMENTS, AND SPACE FOR CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02787 04 OF 04 061157 Z

SEEKING AN AGREED MIDDLE VIEW.

19. KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA REPRESENTED AN OBJECTIVE APPROACH AND A NEUTRAL ONE, AND THAT HE WOULD LIKE TO HEAR ALLIED COMMENTS ON IT. THE BEST WAY TO PROCEED WITH WORKING ON A COMMON TEXT WAS TO DO IT PIECE BY PIECE WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT NOTHING WAS AGREED UNTIL THE WHOLE PAPER WAS AGREED. THE US REP POINTED OUT THAT HE AND THE NETHERLANDS REP HAD BEGUN THE MEETING BY ASKING A QUESTION ON THE FIRST PARAGRAPH, WHICH THE EASTERN SIDE WAS NOT PREPARED TO ANSWER. IF WORK WERE TO GO ON PIECE BY PIECE, IT SHOULD BEGIN AT THE BEGINNING. KHLESTOV AGAIN ASKED THE ALLIED REPRESENTATIVES WHAT THEY THOUGHT OF THE PROPOSED TEXT FOR AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA. TIMERBAYEV SAID THAT THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WAS AN EQUITABLE ONE, WHILE THE EASTERN COMMENT ON THE STATEMENTS PROPOSED BY THE ALLIED SIDE WAS THAT THERE SHOULD BE NO SUCH STATEMENTS PROPOSED BY THE ALLIED SIDE WAS THAT THERE SHOULD BE NO SUCH STATEMENTS. HE THEN ASKED FOR ALLIED COMMENTS ON THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA. THE US REP REPLIED THAT THE DISCUSSION WAS NOT TAKING A VERY BUSINESSLIKE TURN SINCE THE ALLIED REPS HAD STATED SEVERAL TIMES THAT THEY WOULD HAVE COMMENTS TO MAKE ON THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA AT THE NEXT SESSION. HE ADDED IN THIS CONTEXT, HE EXPECTED THE EASTERN SIDE ALSO TO BE PREPARED FOR A SERIOUS DISCUSSION OF THE STATEMENTS PROPOSED BY THE ALLIED SIDE. BOTH SIDES WOULD HAVE TO LOOK AT EACH OTHER'S IDEAS.

20. USTOR SAID THAT THE ALLIES ALREADY KNEW THE EASTERN REACTION TO THE ALLIED STATEMENTS, AND ADDED THAT HE HAD THE IMPRESSION THAT AS A RESULT THE ALLIES WERE PREPARED TO RE- DRAFT THESE. THE US REP REPLIED THAT THE ALLIED REPS WERE PREPARED TO CONSIDER MINOR CHANGES, ALTHOUGH THE MAIN LINES OF THE STATEMENTS WOULD HAVE TO BE RETAINED. THE HUNGARIAN REP REPLIED THAT THESE CONCEPTS HAD NOT BEEN ENCOURAGING FOR THE EASTERN SIDE, AND WONDERED IF THERE WAS ANY PURPOSE TO RETURNING TO THE SUBJECT OF STATEMENTS. US REP REPLIED THAT IT WAS NECESSARY TO CONSIDER THE IDEAS OF BOTH SIDES.

21. KHLESTOV REPEATED THAT THE EASTERN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WAS A NEUTRAL AND EQUITABLE APPROACH, WHILE THE ALLIED STATEMENTS SOUGHT TO SINGLE OUT HUNGARY, AND THUS WOULD BE MATCHED BY
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02787 04 OF 04 061157 Z

ANALAGOUS EASTERN STATEMENTS SINGLING OUT ITALY. KVITSINSKIY ADVISED THE ALLIED REPS IN THEIR PREPARATIONS FOR THE NEXT SESSION TO BE READY TO BE PRODUCTIVE IN COMMENTING ON THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA. KHLESTOV SECONDED THIS THOUGHT AND SAID THAT IF THIS WERE THE CASE, IT WOULD THEN BE POSSIBLE TO EXAMINE OTHER

QUESTIONS.

22. AFTER FURTHER DISCUSSION, IT WAS AGREED TO GIVE THE SOVIET ENLARGEMENT FORMULA AND THE PROPOSED ALLIED STATEMENTS EQUAL STATUS BY REPRODUCING THEM ON SPEARATE SHEETS ON THE THREE- COLUMN FORM OUTSIDE THE TEXT AND WITHOUT DISCUSSION AT THIS TIME AS TO THEIR FINAL POSITION IN THE TEXT. DURING DISCUSSION OF THIS TOPIC, HUNGARIAN REP PETRAN SUGGESTED THAT AN EXCHANGE OF COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS IF THERE WAS TO BE ONE, SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN AN ANNEX TO THE PROCEDURES PAPER.

23. IT WAS AGREED TO HOLD THE NEXT SESSION ON APRIL 6 IN THE NETHERLANDS EMBASSY AT 1430. HUMES

CONFIDENTIAL

*** Current Handling Restrictions *** n/a

*** Current Classification *** CONFIDENTIAL

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 06 APR 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: boyleja
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973VIENNA02787
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: RR
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730436/aaaahvkt.tel
Line Count: 591
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION MBF
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 11
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: boyleja
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 02 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <02-Aug-2001 by reddocgw>; APPROVED <29-Aug-2001 by boyleja>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: <DBA CORRECTED> gwr 971205
Subject: MBFR: APRIL 5 DISCUSSION BETWEEN NETHERLANDS AND US REPS AND SOVIET AND HUNGARIAN REPS ON HUNGARIAN ISSUE
ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH
TAGS: PARM, AU
To: BONN
GENEVA
HELSINKI
LONDON
MBFR
MOSCOW

NATO
SECSTATE WASHDC
WASHDC

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005